

### **REMARKS**

This paper is being provided in response to the Office Action mailed April 10, 2007, for the above-referenced application. In this response, Applicant has amended claims 1-3, 8, 9, 12, 15-18 to clarify that which Applicant considers to be the claimed invention. As noted below, Applicant has cancelled dependent claim 21 herein and incorporated the features thereof into independent claim 18. Further, Applicant has amended the specification and drawings for purposes of clarification. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to the claims are fully supported by the originally-filed specification and that the amendments to the specification and drawings do not add new subject matter.

The objection to the drawings have been addressed by amendments contained herein in accordance with the guidelines set forth in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The objection to the specification has been addressed by amendments contained herein in accordance with the guidelines set forth in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 1-17 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as lacking support in the specification is hereby traversed. The Office Action indicates that "electrode wires sheathed with extruded plastic" is not described in the specification. However, Applicant directs attention, for example, to page 4, line 1 and line 8 of the originally-filed specification that explicitly describes an "electrode wire sheathed with extruded plastic." Applicant also refers to

Fig. 2 and the description thereof at page 7, lines 11-14 of the originally-filed specification. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the above-noted feature is sufficiently disclosed in the specification as to be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art and requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 1-17 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite has been addressed by the amendments contained herein in accordance with the guidelines set forth in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 1-17 once the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 are overcome and the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 20-22, 25-28 and 30-31. Applicant respectfully submits that rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 have been addressed, as noted above, and have amended independent claim 18 to include the features of allowable dependent claim 21. Accordingly, Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance.


The rejections of claims 18, 19, 23, 24, 29 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,128,468 to Bukamier (hereinafter "Bukamier") and the rejection of claims 33 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bukamier have been addressed by the amendments contained herein to independent claim 18 to include the features of allowable claim 21, as noted above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that all currently-pending claims are allowable over the cited prior art.

Based on the above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections and objections. Favorable consideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. Should there be any questions after reviewing this paper, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 508-898-8603.

Respectfully submitted,  
MUIRHEAD AND SATURNELLI, LLC

Date: August 10, 2007

Muirhead and Saturnelli, LLC  
200 Friberg Parkway, Suite 1001  
Westborough, MA 01581  
Phone: (508) 898-8601  
Fax: (508) 898-8602

 Reg. No. 47,499  
for Donald W. Muirhead  
Registration No. 33,978